Castro and Clare Luce, P. 3

Sidney Lens Describes the Jobless Issue Splitting Labor—Reuther from Meany, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 16 APRIL 27, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Is Nixon the Key to Peace With Russia?

A new constellation of forces is slowly becoming visible in the West and, unless some misadventure intervenes or is provoked, may set the stage for a world settlement with the Soviet Union. Three key figures in the cold war have been moved, Mr. Dulles into retirement, Dr. Adenauer into a decision to leave the Chancellery, Mr. Churchill into a new position. In 1946, at Fulton, Missouri, Mr. Churchill signalled the beginning of the cold war; in August, 1950, he launched the rearmament of Germany. Now he warns the West against being "rigid," and calls Russian fears of a resurgent Germany "reasonable." The most sensitive and masterly baton in the West is orchestrating a new policy. In 1953, after the death of Stalin, he tried to bring about a settlement but was thwarted by Mr. Dulles and Dr. Adenauer. This time, with his old adversaries weakened, Mr. Churchill has roused himself for another, perhaps final, effort at peace, an effort which reflects Britain's fear that German revival has gone too far for its own safety and that the balance must be redressed before the Reich, with nuclear arms, can play an independent role.

Nixon Picks Up The Wallace Line

In 1953 Mr. Churchill had to deal with a newly elected and confident Mr. Eisenhower, flanked by an exuberant Mr. Dulles who was sure that he could find something more positive than "containment" with which to fight Communism. Today, Mr. Churchill can work against the background of an American public opinion disillusioned with containment and skeptical of deterrence, anxious if possible for a settlement. The Mikoyan visit indicated that under the ice of official policy there existed in American business circles a warm readiness for trade and co-existence. Most important of all, it appears that with the exit of Mr. Dulles, a fresh hand—that of Mr. Nixon—is grasping for the helm, prepared to exploit this new situation. Two days before Mr. Dulles's resignation was reluctantly announced by the President, Mr. Nixon had already indicated a new course when he spoke to the Academy of Political Science on the need for something more "positive" than "massive military deterrence." While the press played up his proposal to use the World Court for East-West disputes, a more significant aspect of his speech was Mr. Nixon's appeal to the Kremlin, "let us compete in peace. . . . Let the stronger system win, knowing that both systems would be moving in a direction of world peace, with increasing material prosperity." Mr. Nixon was thereby saying in 1959 what Henry Wallace suggested in 1948.

Time and again in the past two years, Mr. Nixon has wanted to do a mission to Moscow. Each time the idea has been vetoed by Mr. Dulles. Now 48 hours after the announcement that Mr. Dulles was too sick to carry on, the news was released that Mr. Nixon would visit Moscow at the end of July to open the U. S. exhibition at the fair. His visit will come after the Foreign Ministers Conference in Geneva and before the expected summit meeting in August or September. Mr. Nixon has long wanted to visit Moscow; the friendly laying on of hands in the Kremlin would finally cure him of the curse laid upon him in the American left by his red-baiting campaign of 1948. Mr. Nixon has the right wing of the Republican party securely in his pocket; it has nowhere else to lodge. Were he now, after an unsuccessful Foreign Ministers Conference, to pave the way for a Berlin agreement at the summit and some beginning of a world stabilization, he might be laying the foundations for a Republican victory and his election in 1960. "Peace in Korea" helped Eisenhower win in 1952. A world settlement by Eisenhower and Nixon would be a powerful elixir with which to perk up the G. O. P.'s chances this time. One more factor must be noted. If there is to be a settlement with the Russians, it will take conservatives to do it. Only they can make a deal with Moscow without being effectively accused of appeasement or of secret Communist sympathies. Peace with Russia is Nixon's opportunity, and Nixon in turn may be a chance for peace.

Bypassing Germany At Last

Such possibilities, and such new perspectives, are opened only by a tacit readiness to by-pass the German problem, and

(*Continued on Page Four*)

Nuclear Bulletin

S. Res. 96, a resolution to put the Senate on record as favoring a suspension of nuclear weapons tests under effective inspection, introduced by Senator Humphrey on March 26 and long delayed by a wrangle inside the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was finally reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee on Friday, April 17. A swift vote of approval was hoped for that day, then expected on April 20, but differences made their appearance in the cloakroom and a vote was postponed.

The resolution was reported with amendments linking a cessation of testing with control of conventional arms but still urges the government to "continue to negotiate" at Geneva. The main obstacle seemed to be the attitude of former AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, consultant to the Joint Committee, who favors wider development of small atomic weapons.

Why the President sent his message for a limited cessation of tests (in the lower atmosphere only) at the very resumption of the Geneva talks is a mystery. That was supposed to be a move of last resort. It would allow the nuclear arms race to continue and new countries to enter the race.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Crisis Compared to That Which Split Lewis and CIO Off from Green and AFL

The Jobless Issue Driving A Wedge Between Meany and Reuther

By Sidney Lens

Walter Reuther was in rare form at the recent AFL-CIO conference on unemployment. The setting of klieg lights and television cameras was 1959 but the words carried the bite of a bygone era. Following Secretary of Labor Mitchell to the microphone he put the needle to the Republican regime. "When Mr. Mitchell said he was going to talk about the Eisenhower efforts to check unemployment, I said to myself: 'this is going to be the shortest speech of his career'." The 7,000 unionists—both employed and unemployed—rose from their chairs to roar their agreement. Catchwords rolled off Reuther's tongue like a waterfall, and each one brought waves of applause. He spoke of the "deficit of leadership," charged that when Ike "stands behind the golf ball he puts the nation behind the eight ball," demanded that the nation balance the family budget before it balances the federal budget, and called for a moratorium on debts for the jobless. Though he paid the usual fealty to the free enterprise system and made the necessary obeisances towards damning communism, some of his proposals had that quality of which militancy is made.

Building Trades Not So Hard Hit

But while the crowd belonged to Reuther, the conference was steered towards impotency by George Meany. Meany, a tough, honest but conservative man who has never walked a picket line, looks askance at action from below. He had yielded to the meeting in the first place only as a compromise for Reuther's proposal to mobilize tens of thousands for a *march* on Washington. The building trades unions that are Meany's mainstay are nowhere near as hard-hit by layoffs as the mass industry unions for which Reuther speaks.

Everything was done to tone things down. Getting into the Washington armory, where the all-day session was held, was almost as difficult as crashing Fort Knox. Each "delegate" had to present a badge and a fancy credential to the sergeants-at-arms. Groups from Buffalo and other cities where the problem is acute, were told not to come.

Those who did come — in six chartered coach trains, 35 buses, and a hundred autos—spent a frustrating day listening to 23 speeches. They wanted to demonstrate in the center of town, put a picket line around the White House, raise cain with their Congressmen. But they sat in an armory two miles from the Capitol doing nothing more dramatic than listen. Senator Paul Douglas made a stirring speech, but the old switchman from Texas, Lyndon Johnson, sidetracked the whole effort onto an empty rail. His proposal to set up a "commission" to study the "stark but true" facts caught Meany's fancy, and the AFL-CIO head latched onto it like a trapeze artist catching a rope.

Jobs and Wages Declining

The facts are already well-known. There were 13.1 million production employees in February 1957; only 11.9 this year though the production index is about the same. Despite a 14c rise in hourly earnings, industry was paying out $43 million *less* per week for its factory hands. Jobs are disappearing as if into a squall, and new ones are not being made fast enough to absorb the 900,000 youth who annually enter the labor force. As Pat McNamara observed: "What we need is action, not a study."

Sidney Lens has been in the labor movement all his adult life. He is the author of four books, the latest of which—The Crisis of American Labor—will be published next month. His articles have appeared in such publications as Harper's, Reporter, Nation, Progressive, and Harvard Business Review.

Both Reuther and Meany are in a box. Their Democratic Party allies in Congress have struck out. Improved unemployment compensation is dead for this year. So is the shorter work week. So probably is an effective program for the 267 depressed areas. But for Meany the effects are not yet acute; he prefers to sit on the status-quo, or at least near it. For Reuther the crisis runs deeper than lost jobs.

For the first time in two decades the mass industry unions are on the wane. After uninterrupted growth they are losing members, finances, influence and bargaining power. The signs are visible everywhere. Reuther's own union, the UAW, is down 400,000 from its peak. Last year it trimmed 101 men from its 750 member staff; this year another 78—and it cut the wages of those who remained by 5 percent. Its 1958 contract package with auto's Big Three was the smallest of any in the post-war period. The mass industry unions which gave labor its "insurgent impulse" in the 1930's—and still have some of it left, despite increasing institutionalization—are losing their specific gravity in the movement as the blue collar work force is reduced and the unorganized white collar and technician work force expands.

This is labor's dilemma. It can't stand still, but it has. When the AFL and CIO were merged in December 1955 there was much talk of a grand organizational drive. Ex-CIO unions pledged $8 million to get it rolling—but it never got off the ground. AFL-CIO was 15 million members at birth. It is now barely 13 million, after expelling the 1.5 million Teamsters.

Unemployed Councils Reappear

The crisis thus turns full circle. The laid-off auto or steel worker not only is downgraded 30 to 50 percent in his wage rates, as he finds work in an unorganized retail store or motel, but becomes a political pressure on his union to "do something." The weakened economy weakens not only the individual worker but labor's bargaining power as well. It cries for some political solutions. To regain momentum the unions need political gains, but their political weight is lighter by each laid-off member.

To redress this balance Reuther is forming unemployed councils in each region and local of his union. Speaking to his executive board he argued that unless labor enrolls the unemployed they will drift to more radical leadership. This is reminiscent of the words of John L. Lewis in 1935 when he warned William Green that unless the AFL organized the mass industries more radical forces would take over the task.

Joblessness thus drives wedges in the house of labor itself —between those who need and seek dramatic action, and those who are immobilized. It has brought to the surface what is probably the most serious difference in labor philosophy in many years.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fulbright and Morse Fight the Sending of Clare Boothe Luce to Brazil

Castro's Queasy Welcome: All We Care About Is Anti-Communism

Time after time under Truman and Eisenhower, I have seen Washington bedecked with flags, crowds assembled and the President on hand to greet some bemedalled little turkey cock of a dictator raised to power by oil or banana politics in Latin America and kept in power by military force. But when Fidel Castro, one of the heroes of our time, comes to town, he has to arrive by the non-protocol back door and the President is too busy playing golf to greet him. The Castro story is almost anachronistic, like something out of the romantic Nineteenth Century. In the age of the atom bomb, when military force is supposed to be overwhelming, a handful of brave men take to the hills and wage a successful struggle to free their country from a dictator whose forces have been trained and armed by the Colossus of the North. Not since Bolivar has any man so thrilled the youth of Latin America, and much would have been forgiven us if Mr. Eisenhower had embraced him on the steps of the White House.

No one would guess from the queasy reception given Castro that there was a time when this country actively supported the struggle for freedom in Latin America; Bolivar, inspired by Washington, was our hero, too—and the Monroe Doctrine was designed to protect the Castros of that time from the Holy Alliance, which sought in the name of religion to stifle democracy everywhere. Now we have our own Holy Alliance; the Vatican is our ally; clerical parties our favorite collaborators in Europe. When a fighter for freedom faces *Meet the Press,* he is greeted with shrill questions about Communism. We don't really care whether a man is a democrat; all we ask of him is that he be anti-Communist. When the Russians execute a Nagy or look with suspicion on a Gomulka, wanting to be sure that he is firmly anti-capitalist, we call it intervention. But when a bloody dictator is overthrown in Cuba, all we want to be assured of is that the liberator won't be "neutral," that his brother is not a Communist, and that he will keep hands off the sugar plantations.

A Female McCarthy

That our country is no longer the hearth of a generous revolutionary idealism may also be brought home to Latin America by the appointment of Clare Booth Luce as Ambassador to Brazil. Senators Fulbright and Morse mobilized little support when they focussed attention at a Senate Foreign Relations hearing on the record which makes her a poor choice for the Brazilian post. To Latin America, FDR was the man who replaced Dollar Diplomacy with the Good Neighbor policy but to Mrs. Luce he was "the only President who ever lied us into war" (speech of Oct. 11, 1944) and his party an organism in which "for 20 years mortal enemies of ours have been growing and thriving" (speech of Sept. 30, 1952). She is a female McCarthy, a spoiled rich woman with more energy than sense, and more ambition than integrity, the wife of a publisher whose *Time* and *Life* are notorious in Latin America for slandering popular forces and propagandizing the cause of the rich and privileged. In Italy, as Senator Morse brought out, she supported the monarchists ("practical politics" was Mrs. Luce's excuse), intervened openly in Italian politics (a matter she explained was picked up "not by the proper American press, but by the Communist and Socialist press," a sideswipe at *Reporter Magazine*) and helped those who were trying to get Italy to hand over its oil monopoly to private U. S. companies. Brazil has a government oil monopoly, too. The prize glimpse of her inner self at the hearing was her afterthought about the "lie" charge against FDR. She said that now that she had become a politician and a diplomat, she realized "one cannot always in a high position approach the people with the coldest and hardest facts in seeking to win them over. . . ."

All We Have to Do Is Exterminate The Russian People

"While in our simplicity we continue to fight the ghosts of 'internationalist communism', 'Soviet communism' and 'Marxist ideology', behind these smokescreens the Muscovites capably apply the borderlands policy of the past tyrants of Muscovy. . . . Russian Communism is the third form of Russian imperialism, the dominant preceding forms being the Third Rome ideology and Pan-Slavism. . . . Our further reverses in the unending cold war . . . will be the direct result of a protracted misconception of the real nature of the enemy, his traditional modes of conspiracy . . . duplicity . . . and centuries long messianism."

—Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University (Jesuit) and chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, criticizing Voice of America before the House Appropriations Committee, April 17.

The Best Analysis We Have Seen of the Tangled Situation in Tibet

"Both sides, inevitably, draw a parallel with Hungary. The rising is represented as a plot by a clique of reactionary landlords, allied to foreign imperialism, from which the Tibetan people have been rescued by their Chinese brothers; and alternatively as a popular struggle waged by the Tibetans for their freedom.

"But the comparison is absurd. In Hungary, landlordism and capitalism had ceased to exist years before the rising, which was caused by Soviet resistance to demands for political and economic democracy.

"In Tibet, the Communists have been content to tolerate the medieval theocracy that has kept the country out of the modern world, in order to prevent trouble. The question of a chance for the common people to gain anything that can be called freedom was simply never on the agenda.

"Certainly nothing of this kind is offered by the tribesmen—or rather nomadic highway bandits—who spearheaded the revolt, nor by the wealthy monasteries living off the backs of the Tibetan villagers.

"The Chinese, on the other hand, can claim little support among the people. There are no Tibetans—as there were no Hungarians—fighting on the Communist side.

"The struggle, in fact, is going on over the heads of the Tibetans, who have not yet entered the stage of history. If there is a parallel, it is with the Indian Mutiny—when patriotic sentiment gathered around dispossessed princes asserting their powers, and an outworn social system put up a futile struggle against the British for survival."

—London Tribune, April 3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indications That Herter Does Not Share Dulles's Black-and-White Views

(*Continued from Page One*)

leave the reunification of the Reich to the better atmosphere of an indefinite future. Until now, Germany has occupied the center of the stage, and all else has been subordinated to the maintenance of that East-West tension so essential to the revival of the German military and the German monopolists. Mr. Dulles symbolized their supremacy. It is significant that amid the columns of biographical material about Mr. Dulles, there was almost no mention of his pre-war record: his lifelong service as counsel to the great German cartels, the friendly relations Mr. Dulles enjoyed from the start with the new Nazi regime, his defense of Hitler's rearmament policy in the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1935, his pre-war debate as an isolationist with Wendell Willkie, his 1939 book "War, Peace and Change"—a Macchiavellian apologia for the Axis—his opposition to aid for Britain and France before Pearl Harbor. History will record that he went into politics after the war and succeeded in rehabilitating the same German industrial monopolists he had served before as private counsel. This was a moralist who never expressed moral objections to Hitler.

Biggest Man In The Job Since Borah

The possibilities of a *detente* are aided by the appearance in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairmanship of a humane and cultivated mind. Senator Fulbright's speeches before the American Society of Newspaper Editors and at the tenth anniversary banquet of *The Reporter* magazine may be found in the Congressional Record of April 17 and are worth reading. Not since William E. Borah in the twenties has the Foreign Relations Committee had a chairman of this stature. "We are going to have to realize," he told the editors, "that a way of life is not necessarily inferior to ours simply because it is different." At *The Reporter* banquet, he attacked bipartisanship in foreign policy as "in theory an instrument of national unity . . . more often in recent practice a gag on legitimate discussion." Senator Fulbright said he thought what our European allies feared was "not a healthy debate conducted by Americans on foreign policy issues" but rather "precipitate announcements of foreign policy which neither Congress nor the country has properly considered." For Fulbright negotiation is a matter of good sense and necessity. This is a long way from the Acheson-Dulles view that negotiation is something to be avoided, lest it relax the tension so long relied upon to bring Moscow to its knees.

How to Get Harry Bridges at Last

Since Harry Bridges has spent most of his adult life fighting charges that he was once a Communist, and one tribunal after another has ruled the charge unproven, the presumption is that he never was a member of the party. In that case, he had no right to invoke the Fifth amendment when asked the question again by the House Un-American Activities Committee last week. Strictly speaking, the amendment can only be invoked when an honest answer might incriminate. The House Committee could convict him of contempt for improperly invoking the Fifth if it now turned around and proved he was never a Communist. We don't expect Mr. Walter to leap on this suggestion, but it would provide his committee with what old time vaudeville used to call a change of pace.

West Germans Dubious of Herter

The new Secretary of State is a minor and unknown star in this new constellation. Fulbright has been lobbying for him; David Lawrence's *U. S. News and World Report* (April 27) reports that the West Germans view Herter "with a jaundiced eye." The best full length portrait of the new Secretary, by Henry Brandon in the London *Sunday Times* (April 19) says that while Mr. Dulles saw the East-West conflict as a "struggle between good and evil," his successor "shares the European approach that Communism is dangerous, but that it is an ideology in which many people believe and that one must seek some way of living with it. He does not see things in black and white. . . ." These are impressive testimonials. Mr. Herter himself, handled by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as if he were too fragile for real questions, gave the impression of a rather colorless, not too vital, stratospherically upper class gentleman. Just why the President treated him so coldly in introducing him to the press at Augusta remains a mystery; there is reason to believe there were last minute attempts to get Herter to work under another Secretary.

You Can Have A Free Copy of Our 1958 Index If You Send A Self-Addressed Stamped Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

4/27/59

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C.
An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED